



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/871,130	05/31/2001	Richard C. Allen	7780.453USD1	3758

7590

08/26/2003

Attn William D Miller
Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
P O Box 33427
St Paul, MN 55133-3427

EXAMINER

SHAFFER, RICKY D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2872

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

09/871,130

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

19

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MR. WILLIAM D. MILLER (3) _____

(2) MS. KATHERINE M. DEVEREUX SMITH (4) _____

Date of interview 8/21/03

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description: _____

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached.

Claims discussed: 13

Identification of prior art discussed: LARSON ('388)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: DURING THE TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW WITH MR. MILLER & MS. SMITH, THE EXAMINER DISCUSSED IN DETAIL THE REFERENCE TO LARSON AND THE LIMITATIONS OF CLAIM 13. MR. MILLER & MS. SMITH ARGUED THAT THE REFERENCE TO LARSON DOES NOT TEACH OR FAIRLY SUGGEST A LIGHT CAVITY HAVING A FIRST DEGREE OF DEPOLARIZATION, AND A DIFFUSELY REFLECTING POLARIZER HAVING A SECOND DEGREE OF DEPOLARIZATION GREATER THAN THE FIRST DEGREE OF DEPOLARIZATION. THE EXAMINER IS OF THE OPINION THAT CLAIM 13 RELATES THAT IT IS THE INCIDENT LIGHT THAT HAS THE FIRST DEGREE OF DEPOLARIZATION, NOT THE LIGHT CAVITY OR STRUCTURE THEREOF, AND THAT THE PSE ELEMENT (109) OF LARSON ITSELF INHERENTLY HAS A SECOND DEGREE OF DEPOLARIZATION GREATER THAN THE FIRST DEGREE OF DEPOLARIZATION DUE TO THE FACT THAT A PORTION OF THE INCIDENT LIGHT RAYS ARE RANDOMLY DIFFUSE, WHICH DOES NOT DISTINGUISH OVER THE REFERENCE TO LARSON.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☒ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

09/871,130
PTOL-413 (REV. 2/93)

Examiner's Signature

ORIGINAL FOR INSERTION IN RIGHT HAND FLAP OF FILE WRAPPER